



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,122	09/28/2001	Masataka Tamura	016910-0475	1777

22428 7590 01/27/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, JONATHAN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,122

Applicant(s)

TAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan Johnson

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 16-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 13, 16-17, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones (6,060,686). Jones teaches irradiating a condensed laser beam generated by a laser source to a certain point of an underwater workpiece (Figure 2, item 18b and 12a); supplying gas to the certain point from a nozzle having a gas exit (Figure 2, Item 22a); the nozzle having an area surround the gas exit that extends to the surface of the workpiece for keeping the supplied gas between the nozzle and the workpiece (Column 3, Lines 25-40).

With respect to Claim 14, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches a nozzle is formed as a disk having a gas exit at the center thereof (Figure 2, item 20c and Column 3, Lines 25-40).

With respect to Claim 16, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches a welding wire supplied to a certain point (Column 4, Lines 50-65).

With respect to Claim 17, the teachings of Jones are the same as relied upon in the rejection of Claim 13. Jones teaches irradiating the workpiece at an angle to the workpiece (Figure 1, item 18b).

With respect to Claims 19 and 21, Jones teaches irradiating a condensed laser beam generated by a laser source to a certain point of an underwater workpiece (Figure 2, item 18b and 12a); supplying gas to the certain point from a nozzle having a gas exit (Figure 2, Item 22a); the nozzle having an area surround the gas exit that extends to the surface of the workpiece for keeping the supplied gas between the nozzle and the workpiece (Column 3, Lines 25-40) and adjusting a gap between the nozzle and the workpiece (Column 3, Lines 45-50); where the gap adjuster includes a sliding member (Figure 1, item 24).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1725

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones as applied to Claim 13 above, and further in view of Cruickshank et al. (3,632,955). Cruickshank et al. teach separating visible light by a dichroic mirror and inputting the separated visible light into an image sensor (Figure 10, items 66 and 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the laser of Jones to utilize the mirror and sensor in order to view the welding with complete operator safety (see Cruickshank et al. Column 5, Lines 30-60).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record does not suggest or teach an underwater laser processing method, particularly where the nozzle has a circular groove on the surface facing the workpiece.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues “Jones fails to disclose a nozzle shaped as a disk.” (Page 4, first full paragraph). The examiner disagrees. During patent examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969). In the instant case, applicant broadly claims that the “nozzle is formed as a disk.” Jones, the prior art reference, teaches the use of a cylindrical nozzle (Figure 2, item 20). In applying the Morris test by giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner construes the cylindrical nozzle of Jones as a disk, albeit a very thick disk. Merely because the disk of Jones is thick does not mean that it cannot be reasonably interpreted as a disk. The rejection is maintained despite applicant’s traversal.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1725

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Johnson whose telephone number is 703-308-0667.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 703-308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

jj *jj*
January 23, 2003

Tom Dunn
TOM DUNN
SUPERINTENDENT OF EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1710